



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,853	03/30/2004	Hyun Sook Kim	1594.1362	2350
21171	7590	01/14/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER HECKERT, JASON MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/811,853	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason Heckert	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/15/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/15/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant presented no further arguments in the response received on 11/15/07 in regards to the previously presented rejections under 35 USC 103.
3. Applicant did submit a new claim 23 for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear whether the spraying of water or the inertial rotating of the drum is the action that occurs just before the spin-drying terminates. Examiner is under the impression that the injection of water is to create a uniform rinse as the water passes through laundry. If the water was injected "just before" the spin-drying terminates, when the drum is about to stop inertially rotating, the water would not penetrate the clothes as the drum would be rotating too slowly to create this phenomena. Thus, it would make more sense if the action was referring to inertially

rotating the drum, the final step in the process. Thus, as written, the claim is confusing and vague. Appropriate clarification is required.

5. Furthermore, the term "just before" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Please revise the claim clearly pointing to the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orszulik in view of Oh et al. Orszulik discloses a rinsing method for a drum washing machine comprising spinning a rotatable drum 16 after a washing step and introducing water to the interior of the drum via a spray nozzle 36 while it is spinning. Orszulik discloses that the spraying cycle can be as short as 5 seconds and that the drum can continue to rotate at various speeds for longer than that. In one embodiment (page 12), the drum is rotated at a first speed for 2 minutes while the rinse water is sprayed on clothes, and then accelerated to a second rotational speed while the water is not sprayed on clothes, so that the rinse fluid can be drained from the clothes in the rotatable drum. Therefore, the time period of spraying water is shorter than the time period of rotating the drum

until termination. Orszulik discloses pumping the water out of the sump 26 located in the washtub beneath the drum so as to drain the machine. Orszulik also states that after 2 minutes at the second rotational speed, the cycle is continued, so that more water is sprayed on at a lower speed, and then drained at a higher speed. Hence, Orszulik discloses an intermittent spin-drying operation. In regards to claims 5-8, Orszulik discloses on page 9 "...if the first rotational speed is constant, the introduction of rinse water to the drum 16 can commence before the first rotational speed is reached and, as a further alternative, the introduction can continue after the drum speed increases above the first rotational speed." Therefore, according to Orszulik, the spraying of water can also occur during a time when the rotational speed of the rotatable drum rises, or more specifically, water can be introduced for a first time at or before the constant speed, and then continue for more time when the rotational speed rises after achieving the constant speed. Orszulik also discloses a control mechanism 10 that controls the amount of spray water introduced into the rotatable drum over a period of time as little as 5 seconds or as great as 2 minutes. Hence, Orszulik discloses the use of preset times. Finally, Orszulik discloses the use of a final spin step 112 occurring after the consecutive and repetitive rinsing steps 106 and 108. Orszulik does not disclose stopping operation of the motor. Oh et al. discloses that it is desirable to change the speed of the drum so that the water travels through the clothing at different angles. This achieves a better rinse (col. 4 line 6 to col. 5 line 12). One of ordinary skill in the art knows that stopping the motor would result in a change of speed, thus providing the result rendered obvious by Oh et al. of allowing water to flow through the

clothes at different angles. Furthermore, substituting one known stopping means, such as breaking, for another, such as shutting off the motor, provides the same predictable result of a reduction in speed. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Orszulik, and stop operation of the motor which would provide the predictable result of a change in speed therefore allowing water to pass through the clothes at different angles, as disclosed by Oh et al., in order to provide a more thorough rinse.

8. In regards to new claim 23, as stated previously, motivation exists for combining the above references to perform the step of claim 1 before the end of a spin-drying step. Performing the step once, is not considered to be a patentably distinct feature over the prior art. The claimed elements were known in the prior art and the combination would have yielded predictable results, such as conservation of water and energy, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Heckert whose telephone number is (571) 272-2702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Friday, 8:00 - 5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571)272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/811,853
Art Unit: 1792

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMH

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Barr', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER